

## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/719,460	11/21/2003	William A. Hood	2-5169-053	2582
803	7590 10/06/2006		EXAMINER	
STURM & FIX LLP			WILL, THOMAS B	
206 SIXTH A' SUITE 1213	VENUE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
	S, IA 50309-4076		3671	
			DATE MAILED: 10/06/200	6

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary		10/719,460	19,460 HOOD ET AL.				
		Examiner	Art Unit				
	•	Meredith C. Petravick	3671	·			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	pears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence ac	idress			
Period fo	• •	V 10 OFT TO EVOIDE A	AONTHION OF THIRTY (2	DAVC			
WHIC - Exter after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DISTRICT IN THE MAILING DISTRICT	ATE OF THIS COMMUNI 36(a). In no event, however, may a will apply and will expire SIX (6) MOI because the application to become A	CATION. reply be timely filed  NTHS from the mailing date of this c BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status				•			
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 13 Ju	uly 2006.					
2a)⊠	This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.						
3)[	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
4)⊠	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> is/are pending in the application.						
,	4a) Of the above claim(s) 14-17 is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
5)⊠	Claim(s) <u>1-13, 22-23</u> is/are allowed.						
6)⊠	Claim(s) <u>18-20</u> is/are rejected.						
•	Claim(s) 21 is/are objected to.						
8)[_]	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	r election requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers	•					
9)[	The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.					
10)	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ acc	epted or b)☐ objected to	by the Examiner.				
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).						
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct						
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	caminer. Note the attache	d Office Action or form P	10-152.			
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).				
a)[	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:						
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
	2. Certified copies of the priority document			Chara			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the prio		i received in this National	Stage			
* 5	application from the International Burea See the attached detailed Office action for a list	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	received.				
Attachmen		<b></b>					
	e of References Cited (PTO-892) te of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date				
3) Inform	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date		Informal Patent Application (PTC	O-152)			

## **DETAILED ACTION**

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 18-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,006,504 to Myers et al., cited by Applicant, in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,550,218 to McClure et al.

The Myers '504 patent discloses a round baler having two flat panels (22) and a netwrap inlet area configured to accept netwrap material wider than the length between the two flat panels. The baler comprises a front side defined by a roller (40). The portion of the roller between the belts (46) is in direct contact with the bale. The baler has a rear side defined by a belt roller (38) that has a length approximately equal to the length of the bale. The flat panels (22) define first and second sides of the bale. Arcuate wedge members (204) are attached to the flat panels and are concentric to the roller. The netwrap material (162) contacts the formed bale in a void created by the wedges (204). What the Myers '504 patent does not disclose is that the baler also has a drum roller devoid of belts in front of the belt rollers. The McClure '218 patent teaches that it is known in the art to provide a round baler with a drum roller (6) leading the belt rollers (40). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide the baler of the Myers '504 patent with the drum roller taught by

Application/Control Number: 10/719,460

Art Unit: 3671

the McClure '218 patent, in order to provide greater support for the bale in the area of the crop

intake.

Regarding claims 18-20: The Myers round baler wraps the round bales by disposing the

wrapping material over the leading belt roller (i.e., the belt roller nearest the intake – see Fig. 4).

Clearly, the Myers '504 patent does not disclose disposing the wrapping material between the

drum roller and the belt roller, since, as stated above, the Myers '504 patent does not disclose a

drum roller. But, as stated above, one of ordinary skill in the art would find it obvious to provide

the Myers round baler with a drum roller as taught by the McClure '218 patent to provide greater

support. One of ordinary skill in the art would recognize that the simplest way to combine the

drum roller of McClure with the Myers round baler would be to move the belt roller structure

rearward – without changing the wrapping arrangement, in which the net wrap is fed over the

belt roller. In that case, when the McClure drum roller is combined with the Myers round baler,

the net wrap material would be fed between the belt roller and the drum roller.

Allowable Subject Matter

3. Claim 21 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be

allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and

any intervening claims.

4. Claims 1-12 and 22-23 are allowed.

Response to Arguments

Application/Control Number: 10/719,460

Art Unit: 3671

5. Applicants' arguments filed 7/13/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive as to claim 18 and its dependent claims.

In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5

USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, the motivation to combine is found in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art since one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made would recognize that providing the baler of the Myers '504 patent with the drum roller taught by the McClure '218 patent would provide greater support for the bale in the area of the crop intake.

As to Applicant's arguments regarding claim 19-20, those claims are rejected above and it is the combination of the references that teach each and every limitation.

## Conclusion

1. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 3671

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Meredith C. Petravick whose telephone number is 571-272-6995. The examiner can normally be reached on M-T 8:00 a.m.- 5:00 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas B. Will can be reached on 571-272-6998. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Meredith C Petravick Primary Examiner Art Unit 3671

September 30, 2006